



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/672,943	09/28/2000	Mitsugu Kobayashi	YKI-0053	7622

23413 7590 08/27/2002

CANTOR COLBURN, LLP
55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH
BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/672,943

Applicant(s)

KOBAYASHI ET AL.

Examiner

Kimnhung Nguyen

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Application has been examined. The original claims 1-10 are pending. The examination results are as following.

Drawings

1. Figure 5 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art figures 5 and 6 admitted by Applicant in view of Yamada et al. (US patent 6,072,450).

Prior Art Figures 5-6 disclose that a digitizing apparatus for obtaining coordinate information (14), and display control circuit (13) for displaying an image on the display by determining timing of horizontal scanning and vertical scanning. However, figures 5-6 do not disclose that a digitizing comprising a light emitting display device having a plurality of display pixels disposed in a matrix and a detector in contact with the display surface of the display device, wherein the plurality of display pixels to emit light.

Yamada et al. disclose in figures 7 and 16 a light emitting display device having a plurality of display pixels (EL element 3) disposed in a matrix and a detector in contact with the display surface of the display device, wherein the plurality of display pixels to emit light (see column 10, lines 48-67). Furthermore, Prior Art figures 5-6 disclose that a digitizing processing circuit for generating coordinate information on the basis of change in detection output of the pen with respect to timing of display; a display control circuit (13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching as taught by Yamada et al. using the light emitting display device having a plurality of display pixels in the device as Prior Art of figures 5-6 because this would emit light at the luminance according to the applied voltage.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art figures 5-6 admitted by Applicant in view of Yamada et al. (US patent 6,072,450) as applied to the claims 1-3 above, and in view of Tomio et al. (US patent 5,745,085).

Claims 4-10, which is dependent upon claim 3, and includes the same claimed element of claim 3, and is rejected on the same reasons set forth in claims 1-3. Furthermore, Prior

Art Unit: 2674

Art figures 5-6 and Yamada et al. do not disclose that wherein the electroluminescence display comprises a horizontal driver circuit for applying a voltage to each column of the plurality of display pixels at the timing of horizontal scanning; and a vertical driver circuit for driving the plurality of display pixels in row units at the timing of vertical scanning. Tomio et al. disclose in figure 1 electroluminescence display comprises a horizontal driver circuit (31) for applying a voltage (39) to each column of the plurality of display pixels at the timing of horizontal scanning; and a vertical driver circuit for driving the plurality of display pixels in row units at the timing of vertical scanning (see figure 1, column 7, lines 60-67 and column 8, lines 1-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings as taught by Tomio et al. for applying a voltage at the timing of horizontal scanning and vertical scanning in the device as of Prior Art figures 5-6 and Yamada et al.'s system because this would control the current which increases the turn-on display rate of the cell portion and detect the current flowing into the cell portion.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number (703) 308-0425.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **RICHARD A HJERPE** can be reached on **(703) 305-4709**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D. C. 20231

Art Unit: 2674

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only).

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is (703) 306-0377.

Kimnhung Nguyen
August 22, 2002



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600